



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,988	05/11/2006	Masaki Fujiwara	10873.1765USWO	5122
53148	7590	03/09/2011	EXAMINER	
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			DIETERLE, JENNIFER M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1759		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		03/09/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/578,988	FUJIWARA ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Jennifer Dieterle	1759	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Nonfinal

(1) Jennifer Dieterle.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Douglas Mueller.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 March 2011

**Time:** 10am

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Final rejection mailed 2/16/11.*

Claims discussed:

n/a

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Alexa D. Neckel/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1723

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Mueller contacted the examiner on 3/2/11 regarding the final action mailed 2/16/11. Mr Mueller noted that upon filing an RCE on 12/7/10 he had also requested suspension of the action. The examiner noted that Mr Mueller had two options. The first option would be for the examiner to vacate the action and amended claims would need to be submitted by 3/7/11 (i.e. the three month extension date). The second option would be for the examiner to change the final action mailed 2/16/11 to a nonfinal and Mr. Mueller would then have the opportunity to file amended claims in his response to the nonfinal. The examiner will then treat these amended claims as a nonfinal and mail a nonfinal action on the merits.

Mr. Mueller contacted the examiner on 3/7/11 noting that he would prefer the second option and will be submitting amended claims.

However, it is noted that if claim amendments are not filed in response to the final action mailed 2/16/11 (i.e. now coded as a nonfinal), the subsequent action will be a final.